

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8

9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10
11

IN RE AIR CRASH OVER THE MID-
ATLANTIC ON JUNE 1, 2009

MDL Docket No. 10-2144-CRB

**ORDER GRANTING *FORUM NON
CONVENIENS* DISMISSAL**

14 _____ /
15
16 In one of the most tragic airline accidents in history, an Air France flight left Brazil
17 for France and crashed over the Atlantic Ocean on June 1, 2009. All 228 passengers and
18 crew lost their lives. Many representatives of those passengers have filed lawsuits in the
19 United States, and those suits were consolidated for pre-trial purposes in this Court. The
20 Court has great sympathy for all the families who lost loved ones in this horrific accident and
21 is interested in seeing those families fairly and timely compensated. But sympathy cannot be
22 a substitute for an unbiased application of the law. Because in this Court's view an unbiased
23 application of the law shows that these matters should be dismissed for *forum non
conveniens*, that is the Court's Order.

25 **I. GENERAL PROCEDURAL FRAMEWORK**

26 There are four Motions before the Court, all broadly concerning where litigation
27 regarding the crash should (and should not) take place.¹ The four Motions are as follows:
28 _____

¹ The plurality of passengers and crew onboard were French, a substantial number were Brazilian, and the majority of the remaining passengers were from European countries outside of France.
(continued)

1 (1) Air France's Motion pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1) to dismiss the domestic Plaintiffs' case on
2 the ground that this Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction under the MC; (2) Air France's
3 Motion pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1) to dismiss the third-party claims brought by the
4 Manufacturing Defendants on the ground that this Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction
5 under the MC; (3) Air France's Motion to Dismiss all actions in which it is a party on *forum*
6 *non conveniens* grounds; and (4) the Manufacturing Defendants' Motion to Dismiss all
7 actions on *forum non conveniens* grounds.

8 This Opinion proceeds as follows. First, the Court discusses and rejects Air France's
9 Motion to Dismiss the domestic Plaintiffs on jurisdictional grounds. Second, the Court
10 discusses why this case is dismissed for *forum non conveniens*.

11 **II. AIR FRANCE'S MOTION TO DISMISS THE DOMESTIC PLAINTIFFS
12 UNDER RULE 12(B)(1) FOR LACK OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION**

13 Air France moves to dismiss the domestic Plaintiffs' case because, in its view, this
14 Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction under the MC. The MC is a treaty, enacted in the
15 United States on November 4, 2003, that covers "all international carriage of persons,
16 baggage or cargo performed by aircraft for reward." MC Art. 1(1). It provides the
17 "exclusive basis for a lawsuit against an air carrier for injuries arising out of international
18 transportation." Kruger v. United Airlines, Inc., 481 F. Supp. 2d 1005, 1008 (N.D. Cal.
19 2007).

20 The MC sets forth five jurisdictions in which an action by a passenger against a carrier
21 may be brought:

- 22 (1) "the court of domicile of the carrier"
23 (2) the location of the carrier's "principal place of business"

24
25 The parties can be placed into four groups: (1) the carrier (Air France); (2) the domestic
26 Plaintiffs (representing the two American decedents); (3) the foreign Plaintiffs; and (4) the
Manufacturing Defendants (third-party Plaintiffs).

27 Only the domestic Plaintiffs have sued Air France as a direct defendant. Indeed, only the
28 domestic Plaintiffs can sue Air France here because the Montreal Convention ("MC"), an international
treaty governing litigation between passengers and carriers, limits the locations where passengers can
sue carriers for injury suffered onboard a plane.

- (3) “where the carrier has a place of business through which the contract has been made”
- (4) “the court at the place of destination”
- (5) **“the territory of a State Party in which at the time of the accident the passenger has his or her principal and permanent residence . . .”²**

6 MC, Art. 33(1), (2) (emphasis added). A passenger’s “principal and permanent residence” is
7 defined as “the one fixed and permanent abode of the passenger at the time of the accident.”
8 MC, Art. 33(3)(b). The parties agree that, if jurisdiction over the domestic Plaintiffs’ claims
9 against Air France is proper in the United States, it is proper pursuant to the “fifth
10 jurisdiction.”

A. Background Facts

12 Air France sets forth facts that it believes show that the domestic Plaintiffs –
13 representing Mr. and Mrs. Harris who perished in the crash – cannot invoke the “fifth
14 jurisdiction” because the decedents’ “principal and permanent residence” “at the time of the
15 accident” was in Brazil, not the United States. Air France’s Mot. to Dismiss Under Rule
16 12(b)(1) (Dkt. 156) at 7.³ Air France points to, among other things, the following:

- at the time of the accident, decedents were living in Brazil;
 - at the time of the accident, Mr. Harris was working for a foreign affiliate of an American company;
 - at the time of the accident, Mr. Harris had been residing in Brazil for approximately 13 months and Mrs. Harris had been residing in Brazil for approximately 12 months;
 - at the time of the accident, decedents were traveling on round trip tickets purchased in Brazil with no stops in the United States;

² The “fifth jurisdiction” is new to the MC. It was not included in the MC’s predecessor, the Warsaw Convention, and its addition “reflects the drafters’ efforts to enhance passengers’ rights under the new treaty.” Baah v. Virgin Atl. Airways Ltd., 473 F. Supp. 2d 591, 596 n.8 (S.D.N.Y. 2007); see also Hornsby v. Lufthansa German Airlines, 593 F. Supp. 2d 1132, 1139 (C.D. Cal. 2009).

³ Page citations to docketed filings are to the page of the electronic document.

- 1 • at the time of the accident, decedents represented that they were “bona fide
- 2 residents” of Brazil and paid income tax there; and
- 3 • six months prior to the accident, the decedents moved over 5000 pounds worth
- 4 of household goods from Texas to Brazil.

5 Id.

6 Plaintiffs provide facts to show that the Harrises’ “principal and permanent residence”
7 was in the United States even though they were living in Brazil at the time of the accident.
8 Plaintiffs point to, among other things, the following:

- 9 • Mr. Harris regularly spent time away from home on temporary international
10 assignments;
- 11 • Mr. Harris never expressed that he had an interest in leaving the United States
12 permanently;
- 13 • The assignment he was on was temporary;
- 14 • The Harrises kept their home in Texas and Mrs. Harris’s son lived in and
15 maintained it;
- 16 • The Harrises received mail at their Texas home;
- 17 • The Harrises left their cars in Texas;
- 18 • The Harrises filed tax returns in Texas.

19 Domestic Pls.’ Resp. in Opp’n to Air France’s Mot. to Dismiss (Dkt. 642) at 16-19.

20 **B. Legal Standard**

21 Attacks on jurisdiction under Rule 12(b)(1) can be either facial, confining the inquiry
22 to allegations in the complaint, or factual, permitting the court to look beyond the complaint.
23 White v. Lee, 227 F.3d 1214, 1242 (9th Cir. 2000). For facial attacks, the allegations in the
24 complaint are taken as true. See, e.g., Whisnant v. U.S., 400 F.3d 1177, 1179 (9th Cir.
25 2005). When the motion challenges the jurisdictional facts presented in the complaint, the
26 court may consider evidence properly before it, and the party opposing the motion has the
27 burden of establishing subject matter jurisdiction. See, e.g., Savage v. Glendale Union High
28 School, 343 F.3d 1036, 1040 (9th Cir. 2003). Where, as here, the motion attacks facts

1 relevant to the determination of whether there is subject matter jurisdiction, the declarations
2 submitted by the parties can be reviewed by the Court. See Polanski v. KLM Royal Dutch
3 Airlines, 378 F. Supp. 2d 1222, 1228 (S.D. Cal. 2005) (discussing Rule 12(b)(1) challenge
4 under predecessor to the MC).

5 **C. The Harrises' "Principal and Permanent Residence" at the Time of the
6 Accident was in the United States**

7 The district court in Hornsby, 593 F. Supp. 2d at 1132, conducted a thorough analysis of
8 the meaning of the phrase "principal and permanent residence" in the MC. That case dealt
9 with a suit by an American plaintiff against a foreign carrier as a result of injuries sustained
10 onboard a plane. Id. At the time of the accident, the plaintiff was living in Germany. As in
11 this case, the carrier argued that the court should dismiss for want of subject matter
12 jurisdiction because the MC made the "fifth jurisdiction" the location where the plaintiff was
13 living at the time of the accident (Germany). The issue before the court in Hornsby – the
14 meaning of "principal and permanent residence" and "fixed and permanent abode" – is the
15 issue before this Court as well. If those phrases combine to mean something like "domicile"
16 then Plaintiffs prevail, but if they combine to mean something like "residence" then Air
17 France prevails.

18 Hornsby reached the following conclusion as to the meaning of the phrases:

19 The only conclusion to be drawn . . . is that the phrase "fixed and
20 permanent abode" is closer in meaning to the word "domicile"
21 than the word "residence," and that the intent of the party is
relevant to determining his or her "fixed and permanent abode."
Thus, intent must also be relevant to the phrase "principal and
permanent residence"

22 593 F. Supp. 2d at 1137-38.

23 The conclusion drawn by the court in Hornsby makes sense. The word "permanent"
24 implies something other than just a determination of where a person was living at the time of
25 the accident, and the available drafting history does not support the conclusion that the
26 drafters meant to eschew a meaning similar to "domicile." Id. Although there was some
27 disagreement among the delegates about including the word "domicile," and it ultimately
28 was not included, that disagreement stemmed from the word's different meaning in English

than in French. To avoid confusion, the drafters used the phrase “principal and permanent residence,” “[b]ut the fact that the language was changed does not necessarily indicate that the new language in the English version was intended to have a substantially different meaning [than domicile].” Hornsby, 593 F. Supp. 2d at 1139. Moreover, treating “principal and permanent residence” like “domicile” is consistent with the purpose of the fifth jurisdiction – “enhanc[ing] passengers’ rights under the [] treaty.” Baah, 473 F. Supp. 2d at 597 n.8; Hornsby, 593 F. Supp. 2d at 1139.

Air France rejects the analysis in Hornsby on several grounds and argues that the Court should focus on the decedents’ residence at the time of the accident. None of Air France’s arguments are persuasive.

First, Air France cites to Seales v. Panamanian Aviation Co., No. 07-CIV-2901, 2009 WL 395821 (E.D.N.Y. Feb. 18, 2009), which it asserts adopted a different reading of “principal and permanent residence” that did not resemble “domicile.” But Seales did not conduct any analysis of the meaning of “principal and permanent residence.” Rather, the court simply held that the plaintiff failed to meet his burden of establishing that his “principal and permanent residence” was in the United States. Id. at *10.

Second, Air France stresses that the inclusion of the language “at the time of the accident” forecloses the conclusion that the language means something akin to “domicile.” That argument is unpersuasive because the phrase “at the time of the accident” merely tells the court the time period upon which it should focus in deciding the location of the “principal and permanent” residence. It does not tell the court whether the inquiry amounts to asking where the passenger was “residing” or instead where the passenger was “domiciled.”

Finally, Air France suggests that treating “principal and permanent residence” like “domicile” is the opposite of what was intended by the drafters because they wanted a straightforward, simple test that did not turn on nationality. This position suffers from two flaws. First, if the drafters wanted the fifth jurisdiction to turn on where the passenger was residing at the time of the accident they could have excluded the words “principal and permanent” before the word “residence.” Second, treating “principal and permanent

1 residence” like “domicile” does not make the fifth jurisdiction turn on nationality. If the
 2 evidence supported the conclusion that the Harrises were domiciled in Brazil at the time of
 3 the accident, then Brazil (not the United States) would be the fifth jurisdiction
 4 notwithstanding the Harrises’ status as American citizens.

5 Accordingly, based on the evidence that the Harrises were temporarily living in Brazil
 6 while Mr. Harris completed an international work assignment, their “principal and permanent
 7 residence” (their “one fixed and permanent abode”) was in the United States at the time of
 8 the crash. See Hornsby, 593 F. Supp. 2d at 1133. Therefore, the United States is the fifth
 9 jurisdiction, and Air France’s Motion to Dismiss the domestic Plaintiffs on jurisdictional
 10 grounds is denied.⁴

11 III. ***FORUM NON CONVENIENS***

12 A. Legal Standard

13 A party moving to dismiss based on *forum non conveniens* bears the burden of
 14 showing that (1) there is an adequate alternative forum, and (2) the balance of private and
 15 public interest factors favors dismissal. See Lueck v. Sundstrand Corp., 236 F.3d 1137,
 16 1142-43 (9th Cir. 2001). A domestic plaintiff’s forum choice is entitled to considerable
 17 deference, whereas a foreign plaintiff’s forum choice is entitled to less deference. Ravelo
 18 Monegro v. Rosa, 211 F.3d 509, 513 (9th Cir. 2000) (citing Piper Aircraft Co. v. Reyno, 454
 19 U.S. 235, 256 (1981)).

20 The plaintiff’s choice of forum will not be disturbed unless the private and public
 21 interest factors strongly favor trial in the foreign country. See Gates Learjet Corp. v. Jensen,
 22 743 F.2d 1325, 1334 (9th Cir. 1984). “[T]he standard to be applied [to a motion for
 23 dismissal on the ground of *forum non conveniens*] is whether . . . defendants have made a

24
 25 ⁴ Air France has also moved to dismiss on jurisdictional grounds the Manufacturing Defendants’
 26 third-party claims. See Mot. to Dismiss for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction (Dkt. 609). The Court
 27 does not reach the merits of this Motion because it is mooted by the Court’s dismissal of these actions
 28 on *forum non conveniens* grounds. Although questions of subject matter jurisdiction typically ought to
 be addressed before procedural questions, that general rule does not apply where, as here, the district
 court elects to dismiss for *forum non conveniens*. See Sinochem Intern. Co. v. Malaysia Intern.
Shipping Corp., 549 U.S. 422, 436 (2007) (“[W]here subject matter . . . jurisdiction is difficult to
 determine, and *forum non conveniens* considerations weigh heavily in favor of dismissal, the court
 properly takes the less burdensome course.”).

1 clear showing of facts which . . . establish such oppression and vexation of a defendant as to
2 be out of proportion to plaintiff's convenience, which may be shown to be slight or
3 nonexistent." Cheng v. Boeing Co., 708 F.2d 1406, 1410 (9th Cir. 1983) (internal quotation
4 marks and citation omitted).

5 **B. Discussion**

6 **1. The MC Recognizes the Doctrine of *Forum Non Conveniens***

7 The domestic Plaintiffs argue that the MC, under which they brought their case
8 against Air France, does not recognize the doctrine of *forum non conveniens*. Domestic Pls.'
9 Resp. in Opp'n to Mot. to Dismiss (Dkt. 644) at 20-34. The basis for this argument is
10 twofold. First, that the Ninth Circuit has already held that the predecessor to the MC, the
11 Warsaw Convention, did not recognize *forum non conveniens* and the language used in the
12 MC is the same as the language used in the Warsaw Convention. See Hosaka v. United
13 Airlines, Inc., 305 F.3d 989, 993 (9th Cir. 2002) ("[T]he Warsaw Convention overrides the
14 discretionary power of the federal courts to dismiss an action for *forum non conveniens*.").
15 Second, that *forum non conveniens* is incompatible with the fifth jurisdiction, the purpose of
16 which is to afford aggrieved passengers the option to sue in their home forum.

17 As discussed below, the Court concludes that the MC does not override the
18 discretionary power of this Court to dismiss an action for *forum non conveniens*.

19 **a. The Ninth Circuit Has Held that the Warsaw Convention did
20 Not Recognize *Forum Non Conveniens***

21 The Ninth Circuit has held that the Warsaw Convention, the predecessor to the MC,
22 did not recognize the doctrine of *forum non conveniens*. Id. The court recognized that the
23 Warsaw Convention incorporated the forum state's procedural law, which as a general matter
24 in this country includes the doctrine of *forum non conveniens*. Id. at 995 (citing In re Air
25 Crash Off Long Island New York, 65 F. Supp. 2d 207, 214 (S.D.N.Y. 1999); In re Air Crash
26 Disaster Near New Orleans, 821 F.2d 1147, 1161 (5th Cir. 1987)). However, the court noted
27 that the doctrine of *forum non conveniens* conflicted with the purpose of the Warsaw
28 Convention – allowing plaintiffs flexibility in choice of forum – and "would undermine the
goal[s] of uniformity [and balance]." Id. at 996-97. Moreover, the court noted further that

1 “when a multilateral treaty has meant to allow application of the doctrine [of *forum non
conveniens*], the treaty has said so explicitly.” *Id.* at 1001.

3 Like the Warsaw Convention, the MC incorporates the procedural law of the site of
4 the lawsuit but is silent about whether the doctrine of *forum non conveniens* is available. See
5 Pierre-Louis v. Newvac Corp., 584 F.3d 1052 (11th Cir. 2009) (aff’g sub nom. In re West
6 Caribbean Airways, S.A., 619 F. Supp. 2d 1299 (S.D. Fla. 2007)).

7 **b. Hosaka Does Not Compel the Conclusion that *Forum Non
Conveniens* is Unavailable in MC Cases**

8 There are two primary reasons why Hosaka does not compel the conclusion that *forum
non conveniens* is unavailable in MC cases.

9 First, Hosaka was interpreting the Warsaw Convention, and Hosaka explicitly noted
10 that it was not addressing the applicability of *forum non conveniens* under the (at the time not
11 yet ratified) MC. 305 F.3d at 1001 n.17. At the time of the Warsaw Convention’s drafting in
12 1929, the doctrine of *forum non conveniens* was relatively new. Thus, the Warsaw
13 Convention’s silence on the availability of *forum non conveniens* dismissal meant that it was
14 not available absent a clear statement to the contrary. Hosaka, 305 F.3d at 1002 (“At the
15 time of the drafting and ratification of the [Warsaw] Convention, the *forum non conveniens*
16 doctrine was not the ‘valuable procedural tool’ that it might be considered today.”). The
17 MC, on the contrary, was ratified recently, and by that time the doctrine of *forum non
conveniens* was well established and had even been used in the United States to dismiss
18 Warsaw Convention actions. Id. Against this changed backdrop, reaffirming (as the MC
19 did) that a state’s procedural law applies suggests that *forum non conveniens* dismissals are
20 available. Moreover, this was the position taken by the United States during MC negotiations
21 and after.⁵ In re West Caribbean Airways, S.A., 619 F. Supp. 2d at 1326 (“In the end, the
22
23
24

25 ⁵ The United States, via attorneys from the United States Departments of Justice, State, and
26 Transportation, filed an official Statement of Interest in the In re West Caribbean Airways case. See
27 28 U.S.C. § 517.

28 The Statement makes clear that the United States did not relinquish the ability
of its courts to apply *forum non conveniens* in Montreal Convention cases
because it and its component agencies are often named in suits arising under

1 consensus among the delegates was to omit any language respecting the applicability of
 2 *forum non conveniens* to avoid imposing the doctrine on States that do not employ it and
 3 distorting its application in States where it is commonly employed.”); Bread v. Greene, 523
 4 U.S. 371, 375 (1998) (“[A]bsent a clear and express statement to the contrary, the procedural
 5 rules of the forum State govern the implementation of the treaty in that State.”).

6 Second, the courts that have addressed this issue in the context of the MC have held
 7 that *forum non conveniens* is available. For example, in Pierre-Louis v. Newvac Corp., the
 8 Eleventh Circuit held that “we are satisfied that a district court may – where appropriate –
 9 exercise its discretion to apply *forum non conveniens*, without interfering with the
 10 implementation of the Convention, so long as another Convention jurisdiction is available
 11 and can more conveniently adjudicate the claim.” 584 F.3d at 1058; see also Khan v. Delta
 12 Airlines, Inc., Civ. No. 10-2080, 2010 WL 3210717, at *2 (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 12, 2010) (MC
 13 allows district courts to utilize their own procedural rules, including dismissal pursuant to the
 14 doctrine of *forum non conveniens*).

15 Accordingly, this Court concludes that the MC does not override the Court’s power to
 16 dismiss an action for *forum non conveniens*. This holding does not render the inclusion of
 17 the “fifth jurisdiction” meaningless, as the domestic Plaintiffs suggest. Rather, the
 18 combination of the “fifth jurisdiction” and incorporation of a forum State’s procedural law
 19 shows an intent to give plaintiffs a choice among different fora but also to constrain that
 20 choice to allow courts where *forum non conveniens* is available to assess whether a different
 21 forum is more appropriate. See In re West Caribbean Airways, S.A., 619 F. Supp. 2d at 1316

22
 23 the Convention and because the United States has a significant interest in
 24 avoiding forum shopping and congestion in its courts when a foreign forum
 25 provides a more just, convenient and suitable alternative. Accordingly, the
 26 United States understands the text of Article 33(4) to mean that the Montreal
 27 Convention “defers to the forum’s laws on all questions of procedure and
 28 manifests an intent by the drafters not to alter the judicial system of any
 country on questions of procedure.”

In re West Caribbean Airways, S.A., 619 F. Supp. 2d at 1328 (emphasis added). Although this Court
 is not bound to follow the interpretation of the MC set forth by the government, “the meaning attributed
 to treaty provisions by the Government agencies charged with their negotiation and enforcement is
 entitled to great weight.” Sumitomo Shoji Am., Inc. v. Avagliano, 457 U.S. 176, 184-85 (1982) (citation
 omitted).

1 (“[A] decision to dismiss in favor of one of the fora designated by Article 33 would not
2 appear to upset the balance the drafters of the Montreal Convention intended to strike
3 between the interests of passengers and airlines.”). Moreover, it is not a court’s role to
4 ignore a policy choice in a treaty (incorporating a forum State’s procedural law, including
5 *forum non conveniens*) because the court might have reached a different conclusion about the
6 best policy after balancing the interests at stake. See generally Bibb v. Navajo Freight Lines,
7 Inc., 359 U.S. 520, 524 (1959) (“If there are alternative ways of solving a problem, we do not
8 sit to determine which of them is best suited to achieve a valid state objective.”).

9 **2. Forum Non Conveniens Dismissal is Warranted in This Case**

10 **a. In Closely Analogous Cases, Courts Inside and Outside the
11 Ninth Circuit Have Dismissed Similar Actions on *Forum Non
Conveniens* Grounds**

12 Courts inside and outside the Ninth Circuit have dismissed on *forum non conveniens*
13 grounds air crash cases brought primarily by foreign Plaintiffs. For example, in Lueck, the
14 Ninth Circuit affirmed a *forum non conveniens* dismissal of the claims of foreign passengers
15 injured or killed on a plane crash in New Zealand. 236 F.3d at 1147. Notably, the Ninth
16 Circuit reached this conclusion even though, as here, the plaintiffs sued American component
17 part manufacturers. Id. at 1140.

18 As to the private interest factors, the court noted that (as here) there was relevant
19 evidence in both the United States and the proposed alternative forum. The private interest
20 factors were not in equipoise, however, because (1) the documents and witnesses not in the
21 parties’ control could not be easily summoned to the United States but the documents and
22 witnesses in the United States (which were mainly in the possession and/or control of the
23 defendants) could be brought to New Zealand; and (2) New Zealand was the site of a lawsuit
24 by the foreign plaintiffs against the carrier, and these related proceedings made it “all the
25 more clear that the private interest factors weigh in favor of dismissal.” Id. at 1147.

26 As to the public interest factors, the court emphasized that although the United States
27 had an interest in deterring the manufacture of defective products by domestic corporations,
28 that interest was “slight compared to the time and resources the district court . . . would

1 expend if it were to retain jurisdiction” Id. Further, New Zealand’s interest was high
2 because (1) “[t]he crash involved a New Zealand airline carrying New Zealand passengers;”
3 and (2) “the accident and its aftermath, including the accident investigation, the post-
4 investigation activity, and the various legal proceedings including an ongoing criminal probe,
5 have all received significant attention by the local media.” Id.; see also Piper, 454 U.S. at
6 238 (reversing appellate court and affirming district court’s original decision to dismiss on
7 *forum non conveniens* grounds litigation resulting from the crash of a commercial aircraft in
8 Scotland); Satz v. McDonnell Dourlglass Corp., 244 F.3d 1279, 1281 n.1 (11th Cir. 2001)
9 (affirming *forum non conveniens* dismissal of products liability claim brought by estates of
10 airline disaster victims because Argentina was an adequate alternative forum and public
11 interest factors weighed in favor of dismissal); Van Schijndel v. Boeing Co., 434 F. Supp. 2d
12 766 (C.D. Cal. 2006) (dismissing on *forum non conveniens* grounds product liability lawsuits
13 stemming from a crash of a Singaporean-owned airplane in Taiwan); Cheng, 708 F.2d at
14 1411 (affirming *forum non conveniens* dismissal of cases stemming from the crash of a
15 commercial airliner in Taiwan notwithstanding the presence of some American plaintiffs);
16 Pain v. United Tech. Corp., 637 F.2d 775, 795-99 (D.C. Cir. 1980) (affirming *forum non
conveniens* dismissal of litigation concerning a helicopter crash in the North Sea
18 notwithstanding the presence of an American plaintiff).

b. *Forum Non Conveniens* Factors

i. France is an Adequate, Alternative Forum

21 Plaintiffs do not really contend that France is an inadequate alternative forum but
22 assert that this Court should take into account that France's court system is slower than the
23 court system in the United States, sometimes taking several years to conclude complex
24 matters. Foreign Pls.' Opp'n to Defs.' Mot. to Dismiss (Dkt. 645) at 36 ("Except for serious
25 concerns about the length of time it takes for as [sic] cases as complex as these cases to be
26 brought to trial . . . Plaintiffs do not quarrel with the gross assertion that, in theory, France
27 provides an adequate alternative forum for litigation of their claims."))

1 In light of the Plaintiffs' concessions, the declarations provided by Defendants'
 2 expert, and the case law, the Court concludes that France is an adequate, alternative forum.
 3 See, e.g., Dattner v. Conagra Foods, Inc., 91 Fed. Appx. 179, **2 (2d Cir. 2004) (affirming
 4 district court dismissal on *forum non conveniens* grounds following conclusion that France
 5 was an adequate alternative forum); Gschwind v. Cessna Aircraft Co., 161 F.3d 602, 606-607
 6 (10th Cir. 1998) (France is an adequate forum).⁶

7 **b. The Private Interest Factors Weigh in Favor of Dismissal**

8 The private interest factors include (1) relative ease of access to proof; (2) availability
 9 of compulsory process to secure the attendance of unwilling witnesses; (3) the cost of
 10 obtaining the attendance of willing witnesses; and (4) "all other practical problems that make
 11 trial of a case easy, expeditious and inexpensive." Piper, 454 U.S. at 241 n.6 (1981); see also
 12 Lueck, 236 F.3d at 1145 (courts should consider the residence of the parties and witnesses;
 13 the forum's convenience to the litigants; access to physical evidence and other sources of
 14 proof; whether unwilling witnesses can be compelled to testify; the cost of bringing
 15 witnesses to trial; the enforceability of judgment; and all other practical problems that make
 16 trial easy, expeditious and inexpensive).

17 As in Lueck, the private interest factors in this case cut both ways but are not in
 18 equipoise.

19 On the one hand, the domestic Manufacturing Defendants are located here, and the
 20 evidence regarding whether any one or more of their products were defective is at least partly
 21 (and probably mostly) located here as well. In addition, according to the foreign Plaintiffs,
 22 the developer of the flight's fault messaging system (not a Defendant) is located in Maryland,
 23
 24
 25

26 ⁶ Historically, some of the delay in French civil proceedings in large matters like this resulted
 27 from French courts automatically staying such proceedings pending resolution of related criminal
 28 proceedings. See generally Gschwind, 161 F.3d at 607. The presence of an ongoing criminal
 proceeding no longer results in an automatic stay. Tr. of Sept. 24, 2010 Proceedings (Dkt. 753) at 60.

1 and the twenty-four “fault messages” received shortly before the plane crashed will be
2 important in determining the cause of the crash.⁷

3 On the other hand, the official accident investigation and a criminal investigation are
4 taking place in France, and all the physical evidence that has been recovered is located there.
5 Specifically, the Bureau d’Enquetes et d’analyses (“BEA”), the French civil aviation
6 authority, is conducting the official civil investigation into the cause of the crash. French
7 civil courts, but not courts in this country, can order the BEA to disclose the underlying
8 evidence in its possession, even while that investigation is ongoing. Beraudo Decl. (Dkt.
9 141) ¶¶ 17-18; see also Section 5.12 of Annex 13 to the Convention on International Civil
10 Aviation (“The State conducting the investigation of an accident shall not make the
11 following records available for purposes other than accident or incident investigation, unless
12 the appropriate authority for the administration of justice in that State determines that their
13 disclosure outweighs the adverse domestic and international impact such action may have on
14 that or any future investigations.”) (emphasis added). That same evidence would be
15 available in the United States, if at all, only via a request pursuant to the Hague Convention
16 or a Letter Rotgatory from this Court, and there is no guarantee that either method would
17 necessarily be successful in obtaining the evidence. Id. ¶ 23; Beraudo Supp. Decl. (Ex. 3 to

18

19

20

21

22

⁷ The “black box” has not been and likely will not be recovered. The fault messages therefore might provide some kind of record of what went wrong on the plane. It is difficult to say at this point how important those messages will be in determining liability and to what extent, even if they are important, any documents or witnesses of non-parties in the United States will be helpful or necessary in establishing liability. Defendants argue persuasively that, to the extent there is any relevant information concerning the fault messages that is not already known, it is either publicly available or is in the possession of a Swiss company. Manufacturing Defs.’ Reply (Dkt. 687) at 27-31. See Lueck, 236 F.3d at 1146 (quoting Gates Learjet Corp. v. Jensen, 743 F.2d 1325, 1335-36 (9th Cir. 1984) (the court should not focus on the number of witnesses or the amount of evidence in each local but on “the materiality and importance of the anticipated [evidence and] witnesses’ testimony and then determine[] their accessibility and convenience to the forum.”)). Even assuming Plaintiffs will need information concerning the fault messages from an American company, and based on the evidence before this Court that seems unlikely, they can obtain it even if the cases progress in France. See 28 U.S.C. § 1782(a).

1 Manufacturing Defs.' Reply (Dkt. 687) ¶ 28).⁸ Moreover, some Defendants are French
 2 companies, and their evidence is located predominantly in France as well.⁹

3 Thus, as in Lueck, because Defendants have agreed to provide all of their evidence in
 4 France but it will difficult to compel non-parties to produce evidence from France (or
 5 elsewhere in Europe) in the United States, the balance of the private interest factors
 6 concerning access to relevant evidence tips in favor of dismissal. 236 F.3d at 1147. See also
 7 Vivendi S.A. v. T-Mobile USA, Inc., No. C06-1524JLR, 2008 WL 2345283, at *13 (W.D.
 8 Wash. June 5, 2008) (describing as "incredibly burdensome" the process of using the Hague
 9 Convention and letters rogatory to compel the attendance of witnesses when "Plaintiffs could
 10 bring their claim in a country where more witnesses reside and where the parties could take
 11 advantage of [the] European Commission").

12 Finally, the ability to bring parties together in France in a procedurally sensible
 13 fashion is another private interest factor favoring dismissal because a consolidated action in
 14 France will "make trial . . . eas[ier], [more] expeditious and [less] expensive." In particular,
 15 there is no dispute that, under the MC, both the foreign Plaintiffs and the Manufacturing
 16 Defendants can sue Air France in France. Here, on the contrary, foreign Plaintiffs cannot sue
 17 Air France and there is a dispute as to whether the Manufacturing Defendants can even assert

18 ⁸ France is also the location of significant amounts of relevant damages evidence, and it will
 19 likely be easier in France to obtain damages evidence from the other Europeans in these lawsuits. See
 20 European Council Regulation 1206/2001; Magnin v. Teledyne Continental Motors, 91 F.3d 1424, 1429-
 21 30 (11th Cir. 1996) ("Witnesses such as the crash investigators, eyewitnesses to the crash, the owner
 22 of the aircraft, those who maintained it, and the damage witnesses, are all in France.") (emphasis added).

23 ⁹ Plaintiffs argue that the evidence in France is simply not important to their case or to the
 24 Defendants. Resp. in Opp'n to Mot. to Dismiss (Dkt. 645) at 48-51. The Court finds this position
 25 implausible. The cause of the crash is hotly disputed. It is simply not the case that the evidence in the
 26 possession of Air France (the carrier), Airbus, S.A.S. (which, among other things, designed and
 27 manufactured the aircraft and performed all testing of it in France) and Thales, S.A. (which
 28 manufactured in France a component part that Plaintiffs allege was defective) is plainly irrelevant to
 determining whether the crash was caused by one or more defective products or by, for example, pilot
 negligence. See Piper, 454 U.S. at 259 n.27 (access to operator's evidence is important); Lueck, 236
 F.3d at 1146 (airline and aircraft records and "records regarding the qualifications of the flight crew and
 their employment" are relevant); Van Schijndel, 434 F. Supp. 2d at 776 ("maintenance records may well
 be crucial."). Plaintiffs cannot undercut the relevance of this evidence by focusing their inquiry on the
 component parts manufactured in the United States. That is especially true where, as here, the available
 evidence as to the cause of the crash is relatively limited and Defendants will need access to all available
 information regarding the parts, assembly, maintenance, and operation of the aircraft to properly defend
 themselves. See Lueck, 236 F.3d at 1146 (quoting Gates Learjet Corp., 743 F.2d at 1335-36).

1 their contribution claims against Air France. Accordingly, France is a superior forum
 2 because actions and/or claims can be consolidated there.¹⁰ See Piper, 454 U.S. at 241 n.6
 3 (Delta Air Lines, Inc. v. Chimet, S.P.A., --- F.3d ----, 2010 WL 3385537 at *9 (3d
 4 Cir. 2010) (a desire to pursue contribution claims against a potentially responsible third-party
 5 is relevant to a *forum non conveniens* analysis) (citation omitted).¹¹

6 **c. The Public Interest Factors Weigh Heavily Toward Dismissal**

7 The public interest factors include (1) administrative difficulties flowing from court
 8 congestion; (2) local interest in having localized controversies resolved at home; (3) interest
 9 in having the trial in a forum that is familiar with the law governing the action; (4) avoidance
 10 of unnecessary problems in conflicts of law or in the application of foreign law; and (5)
 11 unfairness of burdening citizens in an unrelated forum with jury duty. Piper, 454 U.S. at 241
 12 n.6; see also Lueck, 236 F.3d at 1147 (courts should consider the local interest in the lawsuit;
 13 the court's familiarity with governing law; the burden on local courts and juries; court
 14 congestion; and the costs of resolving a dispute unrelated to a particular forum). The public
 15 interest factors weigh toward dismissal for four primary reasons.

17 ¹⁰ Counsel for some of the foreign Plaintiffs said at oral argument that his clients would not
 18 pursue their actions in France if this case is dismissed on *forum non conveniens* grounds and would
 19 instead commence actions in Brazil. See Tr. of Sept. 24, 2010 Proceedings (Dkt. 753) at 21. Such is,
 20 of course, their prerogative. That choice does not trump the private interest factor showing that France
 is a superior forum to the United States for litigation arising out of the crash because all actions against
 the carrier can be brought there.

21 ¹¹ In addition to the foregoing discussion, the Court notes the following by way of summary
 22 regarding its analysis of the private interest factors.

23 The residence of the parties and witnesses, the forum's general convenience to the litigants, and
 24 the cost of bringing witnesses to trial tip the scale slightly toward dismissal. France is a more physically
 25 convenient forum for the French Defendants and any European Plaintiff or witness and is equally as
 26 convenient as the United States for any Plaintiffs from South America. Among the Plaintiffs, only the
 27 representatives of the two American decedents are meaningfully inconvenienced by dismissing these
 28 actions for refiling in France. It is because of the domestic Plaintiffs' inconvenience that the Court finds
 that these factors tip the scale only slightly toward dismissal.

27 In addition, for the reasons stated above, the Court finds that access to evidence outside the
 28 parties' control (in particular, the physical evidence recovered from the crash and any non-public
 evidence in the possession of French authorities), the ability to compel unwilling witnesses to testify
 and produce evidence, and the ability to bring consolidated actions all tip the scale toward dismissal.

1 First, France is more interested than the United States in this litigation. An Air France
 2 flight left Brazil for France carrying a plurality of French citizens and just two Americans
 3 living abroad at the time of the crash. The American interest here, ensuring the quality of
 4 component parts on aircraft and protecting the rights of two American citizens, is real and
 5 legitimate but less significant than the French interest. See Lueck, 236 F.3d at 1147; Piper,
 6 454 U.S. at 268 (“The incremental deterrence [against producing defective products] that
 7 would be gained if this trial were held in an American court is likely to be insignificant. The
 8 American interest in this accident is simply not sufficient to justify the enormous
 9 commitment of judicial time and resources that would inevitably be required if the case were
 10 to be tried here.”). It is of course true that the plane did not crash in France, but it crashed on
 11 its way there, and the physical evidence that has been recovered is located there. When a
 12 national carrier crashes on the way home with a plurality of citizens of that nation onboard, it
 13 is difficult to conclude that the carrier’s country is not the most interested nation in litigation
 14 arising from the crash. Indeed, were the tables reversed and this litigation resulted from the
 15 crash of an American airliner returning from Brazil to the United States with a plurality of
 16 American citizens onboard it is hard to imagine that the United States would not be the most
 17 interested forum even if some of the parts on the plane were manufactured in France.¹²
 18 France’s interest is especially obvious here because it is also conducting the official civil
 19 investigation and an official criminal investigation.¹³ See Clerides v. Boeing Co., 534 F.3d
 20

21 ¹² As counsel for some of the foreign Plaintiffs stated during oral argument, “You have the two
 22 most important powerful companies in France, the largest employer and the nation’s largest carrier . . .” involved in this litigation. See Tr. of Sept. 24, 2010 Proceedings (Dtk. 753) at 21. The involvement
 23 of these two prominent French companies underscores France’s interest in this matter, as does the
 24 significant press coverage the crash has received in that country. See Lueck, 236 F.3d at 1137
 25 (discussing country’s interest in litigation resulting from an air crash and noting the “significant
 attention” given by the local media); In re Air Crash Near Peixoto De Azeveda, Brazil, 574 F. Supp. 2d
 272 (E.D.N.Y. 2008) (discussing media coverage as relevant factor demonstrating country’s interest in
 litigation resulting from an air crash that killed 154 passengers and crew).

26 ¹³ Foreign Plaintiffs point out that France is not conducting the official investigation because
 27 of a prior determination that it is the most interested nation but rather because of the rules about where
 28 such investigations take place when a plane crashes in international waters. But this does not render the
 location of the official investigation irrelevant. First, the rules about where the official investigation
 should take place presumably incorporate some notion of which nation is likely to be the most
 interested. Second, regardless of the reason the official investigation is taking place in France, the fact

1 623, 630 (7th Cir. 2008) (“Greece and Cyprus have demonstrated interest in the case through
 2 their respective criminal investigations into the crash and through Greece’s official
 3 investigation of the crash.”). France is certainly more interested than the country from which
 4 only two passengers were citizens and in which only some of the allegedly defective
 5 component parts were made.

6 Second, France is the superior forum for this litigation because there, unlike here, the
 7 foreign Plaintiffs (who make up the overwhelming majority of those who have filed suit
 8 here) can sue Air France directly. This avoids potential tension with the MC created by the
 9 Manufacturing Defendants’ attempts to sue Air France as a third-party Defendant in the
 10 foreign Plaintiffs’ actions.¹⁴ That tension exists regardless of whether the Manufacturing
 11 Defendants’ third-party claims are barred by the MC.

12 If Air France can be sued by the Manufacturing Defendants as a third-party Defendant
 13 it creates tension with the MC in two ways. First, Air France, though a party, would not be
 14 presumptively liable to the Plaintiffs as contemplated by the MC.

15 [The] “carrier is liable for damages sustained in case of death or
 16 bodily injury of a passenger upon condition only that the accident
 17 which caused the death or injury took place on board the
 18 aircraft.”;

19 [The burden is on the carrier to prove] “(1) the damage was not
 20 due to the negligence or other wrongful act or omission of the
 21 carrier or its servants or agents, or (2) such damage was solely
 22 due to the negligence or other wrongful act or omission of a third
 23 party.”

24 MC Art. 17(1), 21(2)(a)-(b). Second, Air France’s presence as a third-party Defendant
 25 would undercut the MC’s jurisdictional restrictions because Air France will end up indirectly
 26 litigating the passengers’ claims outside one of the five forums expressly provided for in the
 27 MC.

28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000
 1001
 1002
 1003
 1004
 1005
 1006
 1007
 1008
 1009
 10010
 10011
 10012
 10013
 10014
 10015
 10016
 10017
 10018
 10019
 10020
 10021
 10022
 10023
 10024
 10025
 10026
 10027
 10028
 10029
 10030
 10031
 10032
 10033
 10034
 10035
 10036
 10037
 10038
 10039
 10040
 10041
 10042
 10043
 10044
 10045
 10046
 10047
 10048
 10049
 10050
 10051
 10052
 10053
 10054
 10055
 10056
 10057
 10058
 10059
 10060
 10061
 10062
 10063
 10064
 10065
 10066
 10067
 10068
 10069
 10070
 10071
 10072
 10073
 10074
 10075
 10076
 10077
 10078
 10079
 10080
 10081
 10082
 10083
 10084
 10085
 10086
 10087
 10088
 10089
 10090
 10091
 10092
 10093
 10094
 10095
 10096
 10097
 10098
 10099
 100100
 100101
 100102
 100103
 100104
 100105
 100106
 100107
 100108
 100109
 100110
 100111
 100112
 100113
 100114
 100115
 100116
 100117
 100118
 100119
 100120
 100121
 100122
 100123
 100124
 100125
 100126
 100127
 100128
 100129
 100130
 100131
 100132
 100133
 100134
 100135
 100136
 100137
 100138
 100139
 100140
 100141
 100142
 100143
 100144
 100145
 100146
 100147
 100148
 100149
 100150
 100151
 100152
 100153
 100154
 100155
 100156
 100157
 100158
 100159
 100160
 100161
 100162
 100163
 100164
 100165
 100166
 100167
 100168
 100169
 100170
 100171
 100172
 100173
 100174
 100175
 100176
 100177
 100178
 100179
 100180
 100181
 100182
 100183
 100184
 100185
 100186
 100187
 100188
 100189
 100190
 100191
 100192
 100193
 100194
 100195
 100196
 100197
 100198
 100199
 100200
 100201
 100202
 100203
 100204
 100205
 100206
 100207
 100208
 100209
 100210
 100211
 100212
 100213
 100214
 100215
 100216
 100217
 100218
 100219
 100220
 100221
 100222
 100223
 100224
 100225
 100226
 100227
 100228
 100229
 100230
 100231
 100232
 100233
 100234
 100235
 100236
 100237
 100238
 100239
 100240
 100241
 100242
 100243
 100244
 100245
 100246
 100247
 100248
 100249
 100250
 100251
 100252
 100253
 100254
 100255
 100256
 100257
 100258
 100259
 100260
 100261
 100262
 100263
 100264
 100265
 100266
 100267
 100268
 100269
 100270
 100271
 100272
 100273
 100274
 100275
 100276
 100277
 100278
 100279
 100280
 100281
 100282
 100283
 100284
 100285
 100286
 100287
 100288
 100289
 100290
 100291
 100292
 100293
 100294
 100295
 100296
 100297
 100298
 100299
 100300
 100301
 100302
 100303
 100304
 100305
 100306
 100307
 100308
 100309
 100310
 100311
 100312
 100313
 100314
 100315
 100316
 100317
 100318
 100319
 100320
 100321
 100322
 100323
 100324
 100325
 100326
 100327
 100328
 100329
 100330
 100331
 100332
 100333
 100334
 100335
 100336
 100337
 100338
 100339
 100340
 100341
 100342
 100343
 100344
 100345
 100346
 100347
 100348
 100349
 100350
 100351
 100352
 100353
 100354
 100355
 100356
 100357
 100358
 100359
 100360
 100361
 100362
 100363
 100364
 100365
 100366
 100367
 100368
 100369
 100370
 100371
 100372
 100373
 100374
 100375
 100376
 100377
 100378
 100379
 100380
 100381
 100382
 100383
 100384
 100385
 100386
 100387
 100388
 100389
 100390
 100391
 100392
 100393
 1003

If, on the other hand, Air France cannot be sued as a third-party Defendant, then the Manufacturing Defendants will be unable to seek indemnification in the same action in which they are being sued by the foreign Plaintiffs. That would result in exactly the type of oppressive and vexatious outcome that *forum non conveniens* dismissal is designed to avoid. Piper, 454 U.S. at 267 (“[T]he inability to implead potential third-party defendants” can be a factor weighing in favor of dismissal in a *forum non conveniens* analysis); See Delta Air Lines, Inc., --- F.3d ----, 2010 WL 3385537 at *9.

Third, dismissal to France also avoids the prospect of courts in the United States having to apply French law. Although this Court need not definitively determine which law will apply to these actions before dismissing on *forum non conveniens* grounds, see Loya v. Starwood Hotels & Resorts Worldwide, Inc., 583 F.3d 656, 662 (9th Cir. 2009) (citing Lueck, 236 F.3d at 1148), the possibility that French law will apply is an additional factor favoring dismissal. Proyectos Orchimex de Costa Rica, S.A. v. E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., 896 F. Supp. 1197, 1204 (M.D. Fla. 1995) (“Without deciding the choice of law issue, the court finds that the possibility that foreign law will apply weighs strongly in favor of dismissal.”).

Finally, although these cases are consolidated for pre-trial purposes (thereby reducing somewhat the burden on the federal judiciary in addressing these matters), the burden on this Court, other district courts after pre-trial proceedings are concluded, and potential juries charged with resolving these matters would be significant. Given the comparatively limited interest that the United States has in resolving litigation stemming from the crash, the Court finds that the burden on the judiciary and potential jurors if these matters were kept here is another public interest factor favoring dismissal. See Lueck, 236 F.3d at 1147; Vivendi SA, 586 F.3d at 696 (“The burden on local courts and juries unconnected to the case and the costs of resolving a dispute unrelated to the forum also favor dismissal.”).

* * * * *

Toward the end of the oral argument on these Motions, counsel for many of the foreign Plaintiffs candidly acknowledged that the foreign Plaintiffs are forum shopping (and

1 he asserted that Defendants are doing the same). Tr. of Sept. 24, 2010 Proceedings (Dtk.
2 753) at 57-58. This acknowledgment – a reflection of the simple reality – succinctly explains
3 why the foreign Plaintiffs' forum choice is not entitled to much deference. Although it is
4 true that the domestic Plaintiffs' forum choice is entitled to considerably more deference, and
5 the Court is sensitive to the importance of making courts in this country available to
6 American citizens, that deference does not and cannot prevent this Court from dismissing on
7 *forum non conveniens* grounds where, as here, an adequate alternative forum is available and
8 superior.

9 **V. CONCLUSION**

10 For the foregoing reasons, Air France's Rule 12(b)(1) Motion to dismiss the domestic
11 Plaintiffs on jurisdictional grounds (Dkt. 156) is DENIED. Defendants' Motions to Dismiss
12 for *Forum Non Conveniens* (Dtks. 159 and 140) are GRANTED. Air France's Motion to
13 Dismiss the Manufacturing Defendants' third-party claims (Dkt. 609) is DENIED as moot.
14 As a condition of this Order, Defendants shall make themselves amenable to suit in France
15 and abide by all stipulations made in their Motions and at oral argument. See Tr. of Sept. 24,
16 2010 Proceedings (Dtk. 753) at 4-8. As an additional condition of dismissal, Defendants
17 shall not seek or argue for a stay of any civil proceedings commenced in France.

18 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

19
20 Dated: October 4, 2010
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



CHARLES R. BREYER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE